1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DENNIS MARTEL, 10 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-04-0014 DFL PAN P 12 VS. 13 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et al., ORDER AND 14 Defendants. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 15 16 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 17 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Several matters are pending before the court. 18 On December 27, 2005, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint 19 together with a proposed amended complaint. Defendants have not opposed the motion. Good 20 cause appearing, defendants will be directed to show cause in writing why plaintiff's motion 21 should not be granted. 22 On January 19, 2006, defendants filed a request for an extension of time, to an 23 including February 2, 2006, to serve a response to a set of interrogatories served by plaintiff on 24 December 7, 2005. Good cause appearing, defendants' request will be granted nunc pro tunc to 25 February 2, 2006.

/////

26

Case 2:04-cv-00014-ALA Document 40 Filed 03/01/06 Page 2 of 2

mart0014.o

Finally, on February 15, 2006, defendants filed a document styled as an opposition to a motion to compel that defendants represent was mailed to them by plaintiff on January 30, 2006. No motion to compel has been filed in this court on or after that date. Defendants' opposition will be placed in the court record and disregarded.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Within twenty days from the date of this order defendants shall show cause in writing, if any they have, why plaintiff's December 27, 2005 motion to amend his complaint should not be granted;
- 2. Defendants' January 19, 2006 request for extension of time to serve responses to interrogatories is granted nunc pro tunc to February 2, 2006; and
- 3. Defendants' February 15, 2006 opposition to plaintiff's motion to compel shall be placed in the court record and disregarded.

DATED: Feburary 27, 2006.